

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-11, 14-20, 22-26 and 28 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1, 14, 20 and 26 have been amended. Claims 12 and 13 have been canceled.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for allowing Claim 15. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims.

Claims 1, 3-8, 10-11, 16-20, 22-26 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,049,201 to Feldtkeller (hereinafter Feldtkeller) or U.S. Patent No. 6,040,736 to Milanesi et al. (hereinafter Milanesi).

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Feldtkeller in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,295,189 to Perelle et al. (hereinafter Perelle).

Claims 12-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Feldtkeller in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,977,743 to Flock (hereinafter Flock).

Claims 1, 20 and 26 have been amended to include a "wireless communication device," as supported by original Claim 28 and the Specification, page 13, paragraph [1057]. Claims 1, 20 and 26 have also been amended to include the "analog-to-digital converter" and "controller" of original Claims 12 and 13. No new matter was added, and no new issue was raised. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest Claims 1, 20 and 26.

Three criteria must be met to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference, or references when combined, must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations.

First, the references Feldtkeller, Milanesi, Perelle and Flock do not teach a "wireless communication device," as recited in Claims 1, 20 and 26. Feldtkeller (col.1, lines 15-16-17), Milanesi (col. 1, lines 39-40), and Flock (col. 1, line 5) all relate to "motor vehicles," while Perelle (col. 6, line 9) relates to "electric vehicles."

Page 4 of the Office Action states, "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Fig. 1 (of Feldtkeller) to CDMA systems for the benefit of providing a regulated supply voltage to the CDMA systems. Claim 28 is obvious."

But the Office Action does not cite a specific published reference to support this statement or show a reasonable expectation of success. Thus, the Office Action has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Applicant respectfully requests the Patent Office to provide a specific published reference to support this statement, or allow Claims 1, 20 and 26.

Second, the references do not disclose or teach a "load circuit comprised of at least one field effect transistor (FET) device" in combination with the "headswitch comprised of at least one N-channel FET (N-FET) device," as recited in Claims 1, 20 and 26.

Page 2 of the Office Action states "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the circuit of Fig. 1 (Feldtkeller) with a load circuit comprising at least one FET device for the benefit of providing the load circuit with a regulated supply voltage." But the Office Action does not cite a specific published reference to support this statement or show a reasonable expectation of success. Thus, the Office Action has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Third, the references do not teach a "controller" that is "operative to provide a digital control for the charge pump based on the digital signal from the ADC and a digital target value, and wherein the digital control maintains a load supply provided by the headswitch to the load circuit at a selected voltage," as recited in Claims 1, 20 and 26. This limitation was in original Claim 13.

Page 5 of the Office Action rejected original Claims 12 and 13 in view of Flock. Applicant electronically searched through Flock and found only two instances of the word "digital," which are in col. 8, lines 6 and 53. Flock does not disclose or teach a "controller" that is "operative to provide a digital control for the charge pump based on the digital signal from the ADC and a digital target value, and wherein the digital control maintains a load supply provided by the headswitch to the load circuit at a selected voltage," as recited by Claims 1, 20 and 26.

Based on one or more of the reasons above, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1, 20, and 26, because the cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all claimed features.

Claims 3-11, 14-19, 22-25, and 28 depend, either directly or indirectly, from one of Claims 1, 20, or 26 and should be allowable at least for the reason that they depend from an allowable base claim. Applicant respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 3-11, 14-19, 22-25, and 28.

CONCLUSION

In light of the arguments presented above, the Applicants respectfully submit that the instant claims are patentable. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of this Application is earnestly solicited. Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 1, 2006

By: 

Alex C. Chen
Reg. No. 45,591
Attorney for the Applicants

QUALCOMM Incorporated
Attn: Patent Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121
Telephone: (858) 651-5363
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502